




THE REVOLUTION OF FĀS IN 869/1465 AND THE DEATH OF SULTAN ʻABD AL-ḤAQQ AL-MARĪNĪ

By Mercedes García-Arenal

Introduction

If our present knowledge of the history of the Muslim Maghrib is in general unsatisfactory, few periods remain as obscure as the fifteenth century.[1]

The extant sources are very scarce. Contemporary Maghribī historical writings are practically non-existent and, with few exceptions, this is still an epoch for which Christian chronicles are not yet really relevant. Only fragmentary and partial information can be extracted from the contemporary Spanish and Portuguese documents.[2] Therefore, we have to rely for our knowledge on the so-called *manāqib* literature or hagiographic dictionaries which proliferated in Morocco during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.[3] These volumes—many of which were lithographed in Fās during the nineteenth century—cannot be considered a first-rate source. They are posterior to the period dealt with and appear as versions of a traditional history composed over the years by agglomeration, repetition, and revision from a series of original stories which may be doubtful, even though they are hallowed by time and usage, and fortified by the weight of respectability. Committed to writing, they have acquired the seal of authority and have seldom been challenged.

Many of these stories, though frequently rewritten to conform to certain accepted stereotypes or plausible explanations, nevertheless owe their basic character as legends or myths to the political purpose they originally served.

This is particularly the case with one outstanding episode which took place in fifteenth-century northern Morocco: the revolution of Fās in 869/1465 which, with the execution of Sultan ʻAbd al-Ḥaqq ibn Abī Saʻīd, brought to an end the Marīnid dynasty and established a *sharīfī* régime which lasted for some years before the Banū Waṭṭās finally took power.

ʻAbd al-Ḥaqq ibn Abī Saʻīd, last sultan of the Marīnid dynasty, reigned from 823/1421 to 869/1465. When he inherited the throne after his father's murder, he was only one year old.

He owed his election over other candidates to his tutor Abū Zakariyyā' Yaḥyā ibn Zayyān al-Waṭṭāsī, who was the regent and managed, about seven years later, to introduce him into Fās, turn out the rival who was installed there, and have ʻAbd al-Ḥaqq recognized as sultan.

This regent Yaḥyā, former governor of Salé, belonged to the family of the Banū Waṭṭās, related to the Banū Marīn. He died on an expedition in 852/1448. After his death, first his nephew ʻAlī ibn Yūsuf—who died in 863/1458—then his son Yaḥyā succeeded him in power.

Only in 1458, by means of a coup in which most of the Waṭṭāsids were murdered, did ʻAbd al-Ḥaqq manage to take power from them and become the actual ruler.[4]

[1] H. Terrasse, *Histoire du Maroc*, II, Casablanca, 1950, 94.

[2] R. Ricard, *Études pour l'histoire des Portugais au Maroc*, Coimbra, 1955, 3. The Sources Inédites pour l'Histoire du Maroc, so important for later periods, only begin with the Saʻdīd dynasty.

[3] H. Basset, *Essai sur la littérature des Berbères*, Argel, 1920, 273; E. Lévi-Provençal, *Les historiens des Chorfa*, Paris, 1922, 44 ff.

[4] A. Cour, *La dynastie marocaine des Beni Ouattas (1420–1554)*, Constantine, 1920, 44–59; Terrasse, op. cit., II, 94 ff.

By this time the Marīnid kingdom was almost reduced to the region of Fās. The capital city was cut off from Marrākush and the Waṭṭāsids held Aṣīla and a large portion of the countryside. Meanwhile, the Portuguese were conquering the more important seaports, and in 1462 Gibraltar, the last Marīnid stronghold in the Iberian peninsula, was taken by Castile.[5]

From the beginning of the century the influence of two different religious movements and groups, the *murābiṭūn* and the *shurafā'*—which nevertheless tended to overlap—had been rapidly increasing.

Both participated in what Trimingham calls the 'generalized *baraka* movement'[6] which had spread through the country and permeated both urban and rural populations, producing important social changes. It raised the prestige and consideration shown towards the descendants of the Prophet—since *baraka* was something that could be passed down and inherited—and gave birth to extremely powerful Ṣūfī brotherhoods multiplying the number of *zāwiyas*.

The two main *ṭarīqas* to which these brotherhoods were affiliated were: the Qādiriyya, the older one, followed by small *ṭawā'if* of *'ulamā'* like the 'Arūsiyya;[7] and the Shādhiliyya, more important in numbers and power because of the enormous Jazūliyya *ṭā'ifa*, named after its head and founder Abū 'Abd Allāh Muḥammad ibn Sulaymān al-Jazūlī (died between 1464 and 1470).[8]

It is he more than anyone else who is linked with this new aspect of Ṣūfism in Morocco. Al-Jazūlī affiliated followers indiscriminately, without novitiate, and formed a larger devotional school than any other. His order diffused so rapidly that many older ones were absorbed or eclipsed.

At the same time the *shurafā'* who, mainly in Fās, were already an important economic and social class, were trying to exploit their new prestige politically.

It is difficult to separate their movement from the *murābiṭūn*: gradually, the founders and heads of the most important *ṭawā'if* are found to be *shurafā'*. Al-Jazūlī himself was supposed to be a Ḥasanī *sharīf* and his brotherhood, more than any other, was associated with the *shurafā'*: so many of them were in its ranks that it was known as the 'Brotherhood of the *Shurafā'*'.[9]

On the other hand, the Waṭṭāsid viziers strengthened the position of the *shurafā'* to use them for their own political aims. The outcome was the discovery in Rajab 841/1437 of the tomb of Mawlāy Idrīs in Fās al-Balī and the subsequent foundation—by the Waṭṭāsid vizier and the *mizwar al-shurafā'*[10]—of the sanctuary.[11]

In this same year (1437), the Jewish community of Fās, which had been suffering increasingly during the confusion reigning in the city from the early fifteenth century,[12] either for reasons of safety or because the *madīna* was now

[5] Ceuta in 1415, Ksar al-Seguir in 1458, Anfa in 1462, Tangier in 1464. Cf. Terrasse, op. cit., II, 109; Ricard, op. cit., 6 ff., 42 ff.

[6] J. S. Trimingham, *The Sufi orders in Islam*, Oxford, 1971, 84.

[7] Founded around 854–64/1450–60 by Abū 'l-'Abbās Aḥmad ibn 'Arūs; Trimingham, op. cit., 87; R. Brunschvig, *La Berbérie orientale sous les Hafsides*, Paris, 1940, II, 341 ff.

[8] Terrasse, op. cit., II, 145; *Archives Marocaines*, XIX, 1913, 275–91; Trimingham, op. cit., 84–6.

[9] Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad al-Fāsī, *Kitāb mumti' al-asmā'*, Fās, 1305/1887–8. The most popular work of al-Jazūlī is a series of eulogies in honour of the Prophet and his household.

[10] Equivalent, in Morocco, of *naqīb*. Arabicized form of the Berber *amzwār* 'he who precedes, he who is placed at the head', designates the chief of a religious brotherhood or of a body of *shurafā'*. Cf. E. Lévi-Provençal, '*Mizwar*', *EI*, first ed.; R. Montagne, *Les Berbères et le Makhzen dans le Sud du Maroc*, Paris, 1930, 222.

[11] G. Salmon, 'Le culte de Muley Idrîs et la Mosquée des Chorfa à Fès', *Archives Marocaines*, III, 3, 1905, 415.

[12] H. Z. Hirschberg, *A history of the Jews in North Africa*, second ed., Leiden, 1974, 390.

a holy place in which unbelievers could not reside, was transferred to the Mellāḥ in Fās Jadīd.[13] The Jewish population of Fās, considerably increased since 1391 by the arrival of large numbers of Spanish Jews, played an important role in the financial and commercial affairs of the town.[14]

The political tension, centred in Fās, resulted from three conflicting forces: the sultan, now without his traditional support, the Waṭṭāsids; the Waṭṭāsids themselves, now in opposition; the *shurafā'*, heading an urban and religious party which included one or more of the main Ṣūfī brotherhoods; together with a fourth and less clearly defined group, consisting of *'ulamā'* and small Ṣūfī brotherhoods in rivalry with the others.

This tension reached its peak during the final years of 'Abd al-Ḥaqq's long reign.

The standard interpretation of the revolution of 869/1465 to be found in textbooks of Moroccan history takes up the version of the Moroccan tradition.

According to this, after getting rid of the Banū Waṭṭās in 1458, 'Abd al-Ḥaqq selected a Jew called Hārūn as his new vizier. This Hārūn appointed to positions of importance another Jew or Jews who ruled and oppressed the people, crushing them with taxes from which not even the *shurafā'* were exempt.

They ruled despotically, in disregard of Islam, and acted as sultan on the occasions when 'Abd al-Ḥaqq had to be away from Fās.

On one of these occasions a Jewish governor insulted a *sharīfī* lady when collecting the taxes, to the extent of beating her and increasing his violence when she invoked the Prophet.

When the *khaṭīb* of the Qarawiyyīn, 'Abd al-'Azīz ibn Mūsā al-Waryāghilī, who had been preaching against the Jews knew of this event, he incited the people to rise. Under his leadership, the mob sacked the Mellāḥ, massacred its population, and took the palace, electing Muḥammad ibn 'Imrān al-Jūtī, *mizwar al-shurafā'* of Fās, as the new sultan.

When 'Abd al-Ḥaqq came back to Fās, he was taken prisoner and then executed, sacrificed like a sheep at the *'Īd al-Aḍḥā*.[15]

Analysis of the sources

For the events in Fās in 869/1465 we rely on four different kinds of sources.

I. *Non-Moroccan Arabic sources. 'Abd al-Bāsiṭ ibn Khalīl, al-Zarkashī, and al-Jannābī*

They are the sources nearest in time to the events of 1465.

The only contemporary account that has reached us is preserved in the travel diary or *riḥla* of 'Abd al-Bāsiṭ ibn Khalīl al-Malaṭī or al-Ḥanafī, an Egyptian merchant and author who was travelling in North Africa and

[13] D. Corcos, 'Les juifs du Maroc et leurs Mellahs', in H. Z. Hirschberg (ed.), *Mélanges Abraham Elmaleh*, Jerusalem, 1972, p. xx ff.; R. Le Tourneau, *Fes in the age of the Marinids*, Norman, Oklahoma, 1961, 16. Terrasse, op. cit., II, 93, places the transfer to the Mellāḥ at the time of the foundation of Fās Jadīd in the reign of Abū Yūsuf Ya'qūb. Leo Africanus places the event under Abū Sa'īd 'Uthmān III (800–23/1398–1421) and is followed by L. Massignon, *Le Maroc dans les premières années du XVIe siècle*, Alger, 1906, 227.

[14] N. Slousch, 'Études sur l'histoire des juifs au Maroc', *Archives Marocaines*, VI, 1–2, 1905, 147.

[15] This story can be found in many modern authors, mainly: A. Cour, op. cit., 44 ff.; Terrasse, op. cit., II, 94 ff.; Massignon, op. cit., 158; Slousch, art. cit., 148; Corcos, art. cit., p. xxiv, a[illegible] The Jews of Morocco under the Marinids', *Jewish Quarterly Review*, LIV, 4, 1964, 271 ff.; Hirschberg, op. cit., 391 ff.; D. Lopes, *Arcila e o dominio portugues*, Coimbra, 1924, 26 ff.

al-Andalus at the time.[16] He arrived in Tlemcen in Dhū 'l-Ḥijja 868/August 1464 with the intention of continuing to Fās, but the political events in this town prevented him from visiting it. Instead, he spent more than a year in Tlemcen and went to al-Andalus afterwards.

His is the longest and most detailed (it looks almost first-hand) extant relation of the revolution of 1465. It may be summarized as follows.[17]

'Abd al-Ḥaqq is presented as a sultan without power. This is held by the Waṭṭāsid viziers. He plots, and eventually overthrows the Waṭṭāsids, killing most of them.

Once in command, 'Abd al-Ḥaqq appoints a Waṭṭāsid as vizier but gives him no power, to humiliate him.[18] Then he appoints ' a Jew of Fās named Hārūn ibn Baṭash [19] who was a money-changer or dealt with the financial affairs of the viziers, and made him a deputy vizier '.[20] He does so to annoy the Banū Waṭṭās and their party, and also because a Jew could not be a political threat or represent a political group.

However, Hārūn not only takes all the power of a real Muslim vizier as well as the outward signs while remaining faithful to his Jewish religion,[21] but also appoints his fellow-Jews to positions of importance. In Fās this is seen as a gross affront to Islam.

In 1465 'Abd al-Ḥaqq leaves Fās with Hārūn for a visit to the country. Hārūn leaves a relative, Shawīl ibn Baṭash, at Fās in his place. Shawīl rules Fās and the people are increasingly angry. Finally, when he insults and strikes a *sharīfa*, the situation explodes.

The incident comes to the knowledge of the *khaṭīb* of the Qarawiyyīn, Sīdī Abū 'Abd Allāh Muḥammad,[22] who has been preaching against the Jews and inciting the people to rebel. He goes through the streets rousing the mob to vengeance in a *jihād* against the infidel. The people follow him and ' they were joined by a great multitude from all the low places '.[23]

They go to the *mizwar al-shurafā'*, Muḥammad ibn 'Imrān, to obtain his approval for a rebellion. The *sharīf* refuses on the grounds that rebellion is unlawful without a legal opinion—the *'ulamā'* should be consulted.

The *'ulamā'* are therefore approached for a *fatwā* giving the approval of the law. But the senior *'ālim* and *muftī* Sīdī Abū 'Abd Allāh Muḥammad al-Qawrī refuses, affirming that rebellion is unlawful. He is then threatened with death and forced to give his written approval in the form of a *fatwā* permitting the killing of the Jews and another allowing rebellion against them and the sultan.

The mob then goes into the Jewish quarter, massacres the inhabitants to

[16] R. Brunschvig, *Deux récits de voyages inédits en Afrique du Nord au* XV*e siècle*, Paris, 1936, 6 ff.

[17] The *riḥla* of 'Abd al-Bāsiṭ ibn Khalīl is entitled *al-Rawḍ al-bāsim fī ḥawādith al-'umr wa 'l-tarājim*. Cf. Levi Della Vida, ' Une nouvelle source pour l'histoire de l'Afrique du Nord à la fin du XVe siècle ', *Hespéris*, XIX, 1934, 198–9. Ed. and tr. in Brunschvig, *Deux récits*, text, 48–55, tr., 113–21. Cf. also Hirschberg, op. cit., tr., 393–9.

[18] This is the only source to mention a fourth, puppet-like Waṭṭāsid vizier.

[19] Baṭas/Baṭash is a surname of Hispano-Arabic origin. At the beginning of the sixteenth century, Moshe Aben Batash was one of the leaders of the Hispano-Portuguese Jews at Fās. Cf. Corcos, ' Réflexions sur l'onomastique judéo-nord-Africaine ', in his *Studies in the history of the Jews of Morocco*, Jerusalem, 1976, 13; M. Eisenbeth, *Les juifs de l'Afrique du Nord (démographie et onomastique)*, Alger, 1936, 92.

[20] Hirschberg, op. cit., 394.

[21] 'Abd al-Bāsiṭ insists in three different places that Hārūn never wanted to become a convert.

[22] In the Moroccan sources he is called Abū Fāris 'Abd al-'Azīz ibn Mūsā al-Waryāghilī (see below), with the exception of Ibn 'Askar who calls him Abū Muḥammad 'Abd Allāh al-Waryāghilī. Cf. *Dawḥat al-nāshir*, tr. A. Graulle, *Archives Marocaines*, XIX, 1913, 58–63.

[23] Sūra XXII, 28. Cf. Hirschberg, op. cit., 396.

the last man, and takes their property. The palace is also stormed and Shawīl killed.

The *sharīf* Muḥammad ibn 'Imrān is installed as governor and the people prepare to pay homage to him.

' It was then suggested to them by experienced and sensible persons from among the educated and intelligent that they must not proceed in this way before they had defeated the sultan 'Abd al-Ḥaqq, lest ill befall them.' [24] To avoid any risk they decide to deceive him. The notables of Fās and the *sharīf* send the sultan a letter to lure him back saying that power is held for him until his return.

'Abd al-Ḥaqq is advised by Hārūn that the letter is a trap and that they should go to Tāzā instead, until it is safe to return. But 'Abd al-Ḥaqq is blinded by fate. His hour is near and destiny will have its way.[25]

He accuses Hārūn of being responsible for what is happening. Hārūn is promptly killed by a Marīnid, to please Fās, and the sultan is advised to return. Still blinded by fate [26] he consents to this folly.

Driven by destiny, he hurries to Fās alone, while his army lags behind deliberately, so that he arrives with only a few members of his entourage.

The people of Fās come to meet him pretending to welcome him. With them goes a group of people, the *wakkāra*, outcasts, who, shouting ' holy war ! ', drag the sultan from his horse, take him to the slaughterhouse, and butcher him like a sheep. It was 22 Ramaḍān 869/18 May 1465.

Muḥammad ibn 'Imrān is invested by the crowd. The Waṭṭāsids endeavour to return but are excluded from Fās which cuts itself off from the rest of the kingdom. As news spreads, massacres of Jews take place in other cities : ' The Jews were thus befallen by a calamity the like of which had never occurred before.' [27]

The account preserved in the *riḥla* of 'Abd al-Bāsiṭ ibn Khalīl may have been a sort of official report or explanation sent from Fās by the new sharīfian government to the court of Tlemcen (where 'Abd al-Bāsiṭ was at the time), whose sultan was a friend and ally of 'Abd al-Ḥaqq, intended to justify the recent events and present them in such a way that no *sharīfī* responsibility or blame could be implied.

It is the most apologetic account extant, carefully constructed to form a fine piece of literature in which there are no loose ends.

The essential element, the deposition and death of the sultan, an abhorrent occurrence, is disguised and diluted by a series of themes.

The wicked Jews, in whose hands 'Abd al-Ḥaqq has put himself, are held to be the ultimate cause of the rebellion. The occasion is the episode of the *sharīfa*, which lets loose the righteous wrath of an indignant and uncontrolled people upon the entire Jewish community. The due punishment of the Jews is dwelt on to the exclusion of the principal event—the seizure of power.

This treatment of the Jewish theme finds its counterpart in the discussion of the Muslim attitude. Emphasis is placed on the rightfulness of the massacre, while the element of revolution is treated apologetically. The role of the *sharīf*, the *'ulamā'*, and those ' experienced and sensible persons from among the educated and intelligent ' who advise the people and go on to plot the letter

[24] Hirschberg, op. cit., 397.
[25] *lākin idhā nazala al-qaḍā' 'amiya al-baṣar* ; Brunschvig, *Deux récits*, 54.
[26] *wa-kāna ra'yan fāsidan li-ghalabat al-qaḍā' wa 'l-qadar wa-farāgh ajl 'Abd al-Ḥaqq wa-ḥuḍūr maniyyatihi* ; ibid.
[27] Hirschberg, op. cit., 298.

to be sent to the sultan, is disguised first by the theme of the *fatwā* issued under duress (the report insists at length on al-Qawrī's resistance, only consenting to grant the *fatwā* when confronted by the alternative of being killed), second by the pious reluctance of Muḥammad ibn 'Imrān who does not want to participate in the rebellion until he gets the written approval of the law, and third, because the seizure of power, scarcely mentioned, is passed by as a minor consequence of the revolution, never as its aim.[28]

The plot to kill 'Abd al-Ḥaqq after the seizure of power is described, but rapidly subordinated to the theme of destiny overtaking the sultan. The letter sent to deceive him into returning is the occasion of his fate, just as the *sharīfa* is the occasion of the destruction of the Jews which is likewise almost by a law of nature.

The theme of destiny, of blind fate operating impersonally in accordance with the will of God is nicely concluded with the introduction of the *wakkāra*, an alien group outside society, and the ritual character of the sultan's death.

Despite the presentation and shape of the episodes which offer an interpretation peculiar to this account, the story is basically the same as the version of the Moroccan tradition. Nevertheless, as it is longer and more detailed, it contains several elements not mentioned in later accounts.

First of all Sīdī Muḥammad al-Qawrī, whom the rebels force to give the two *fatwās*, never returns to the stage, although he was actually *muftī* in Fās at the time.

Abū 'Abd Allāh Muḥammad al-Qawrī, according to the books of *manāqib*, was of Andalusian origin. He studied in Meknes, where he was born, and in Fās, where he acquired a great reputation as *'ālim* and *muftī*. Although we have long accounts of his teachers, studies, deeds, etc., none of the Moroccan sources relates him to the rebellion in Fās.[29]

Another element is the *wakkāra*: ' a band of people known as *al-wakkāra*, who are like the *zu'ar* in these countries ', 'Abd al-Bāsiṭ says. Brunschvig [30] defines *wakkāra* as ' debauchés, habitués des lupanars '.

Zu'ar is the better-known term: it appears in Egyptian sources in the fifteenth century as the designation of organized gangs of young men generally belonging to the quarters outside the city walls and to surrounding villages. A number of the *zu'ar* chiefs were styled *sharīfs* and they had connexions with Ṣūfī brotherhoods. Their ranks incorporated all kinds of people on the fringe of society. These *zu'ar* sometimes acted in the interest of their quarters. They constituted the backbone of massive resistance to taxation, frequently assaulting or murdering tax-collectors.[31]

In Cairo and Alexandria, probably the example that 'Abd al-Bāsiṭ had in mind, they formed mainly a ' lumpenproletarian group ' indulging in organized violence, made up almost wholly of criminals and thieves, and widely feared as plunderers.[32]

[28] To the point that Hirschberg considers it difficult to see more than ' the double-faced attitude of the superintendent of the *shurafā'*, who wished to profit by the incitement without running any risk ', op. cit., 393.

[29] Aḥmad Bābā, *Nayl al-ibtihāj*, Cairo, 1351/1932, 318–20; Ibn al-Qāḍī, *Durrat al-ḥijāl*, ed. Allouche, Rabāṭ, 1936, I, 299; *Jadwā al-iqtibās*, Fās, 1303/1891, 203; al-Kittānī, *Salwā al-anfās*, Fās, 1316/1898, II, 116; al-Nāṣirī, *Kitāb al-istiqṣā'*, second ed., Casablanca, 1956, II, 101.

[30] cf. *Deux récits*, p. 120, n. 1.

[31] I. Lapidus, *Muslim cities in the later Middle Ages*, Cambridge, Mass., 1967, 153–64.

[32] Lapidus, op. cit., 137–77. Cf. also Brinner, ' *Ḥarfūsh* ', *EI*, second ed.

A subsequent account of the events of 1465, also close in time, is found in the work of the Ifrīqiyan author al-Zarkashī (d. 932/1525) called *Tārīkh al-dawlatayn*.[33] Al-Zarkashī gives a short but interesting version of the episode. It is very brief and the possible legendary elements are less obvious. The rebellion is presented as a sharīfian coup.[34] The Jew Hārūn, whom he calls *ra'īs al-dawla*, is still mentioned as the basic cause of the rebellion which, according to al-Zarkashī, took place when the sultan was away fighting the Banū Waṭṭās who had mastered Tāzā and Tangier.[35]

The *sharīf* takes Fās in accordance with the will of the people, tired of 'Abd al-Ḥaqq and his Jews' oppression. The army abandons 'Abd al-Ḥaqq at the news of the rebellion, so that 'Abd al-Ḥaqq and Hārūn come back to town with only a few men. On arrival they are taken prisoner and executed.

The Jews are then massacred. The movement appears as a popular rebellion headed by the *sharīf*. Neither the *khaṭīb* of the Qarawiyyīn, nor the episode of the *sharīfa* is mentioned.

Fagnan includes in his translation a marginal note of his MS (probably from the copyist) which is not to be found in the edition of Tunis. It says: ' (Hārūn) is Abū Jinnāḥ's brother, may they both be damned, he took away the alms distributed to the *'ulamā'* to give them to poor Jews '.[36]

Another version is to be found in the *Al-baḥr al-zakhkhār wa 'l-'aylam al-tayyār*[37] written *c.* 983/1575 by the Oriental author Musṭafā ibn Ḥasan al-Jannābī (d. 999/1590).[38]

In 869 the authority of the Jews becomes great in Fās, because of the Jewish vizier that 'Abd al-Ḥaqq has appointed after the execution of his Banū Waṭṭās viziers. The people of Fās rise against the Jews and massacre them to the last man, and eventually slit the throat of 'Abd al-Ḥaqq.

The origin of this rebellion is found in the Jewish vizier who demands that a *sharīfī* lady pay her taxes at once. The lady says: ' Are you going to harm a woman who has the Prophet of God among her ancestors ? '. The Jew answers: ' If the Prophet of God is your ancestor, may he come and take you from my hands ! '. The people rise, burn the Jew, and also kill the sultan, of whom al-Jannābī writes a long paragraph of praise. 'Abd al-Ḥaqq is said to be reputed for his justice and equity, his knowledge of *fiqh*, etc.

The account finishes with reference to 'Abd al-Ḥaqq's great age when he died. His place was taken by the *mizwar al-shurafā'* Muḥammad ibn 'Imrān.

Al-Jannābī's version differs from al-Zarkashī's in being mainly centred around the anecdote of the *sharīfī* lady, a more embellished anecdote in which the Jewish vizier appears still more wicked and blasphemous.

The praise of 'Abd al-Ḥaqq is unique and not to be found in any other Arabic source. Al-Jannābī does not quote anyone as the source of his version, but we know that he was acquainted with the *riḥla* of 'Abd al-Bāsiṭ which he copies or summarizes in several passages of his work.[39] It is thus very probable that it is his source also for this particular episode.

[33] Tunis, 1878, 140–1, and tr. E. Fagnan, Constantine, 1895, 258–60.
[34] *qāma bi-madīnat Fās mizwar al-shurafā' bi-hā . . . 'alā al-sulṭān 'Abd al-Ḥaqq.*
[35] Tangier was already Portuguese in 1464.
[36] Fagnan, op. cit., 258.
[37] Bodleian, Uri. 785. Tr. Fagnan, *Extraits inédits relatifs au Maghreb*, Alger, 1924, 312–14.
[38] cf. Brockelmann, *GAL*, Suppl., II, 411.
[39] Brunschvig, *La Bérberie orientale*, I, p. xxxi.

II. *The Moroccan tradition, from Ibn al-Qāḍī (sixteenth century) to al-Nāṣirī (nineteenth century)*

The first Moroccan author in whose work an account of the revolution of 1465 can be found is Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn al-Qāḍī (960–1025/1552–1616).[40] He includes a lengthy description in his *Durrat al-ḥijāl*,[41] a dictionary of illustrious *'ulamā'* and Islamic celebrities. The *Durra* was started in 1591, more than a century after the episodes related.[42] Corcos affirms [43] that Ibn al-Qāḍī obtained his information from contemporary local sources. No Moroccan source previous to his has been found which mentions the revolution in Fās, nor does Ibn al-Qāḍī quote another author.

In the seventeenth century the story is briefly recorded by 'Abd al-Salām al-Qādirī in his *al-Durr al-sanī*,[44] a book on the Idrīsid *shurafā'* of Fās.

In the following century his grandson Muḥammad ibn al-Ṭayyib al-Qādirī (1124–84/1712–73) repeats Ibn al-Qāḍī's and his grandfather's version in his *Nashr al-mathānī.*

Finally in the nineteenth century Aḥmad ibn Khālid al-Nāṣirī merges the previous versions in a lengthy report.

Basically these authors all relate the same story. Even when they do not mention their sources it is easy to see who is quoting whom because they generally copy down whole paragraphs word for word. But the order of episodes and so their importance, and the role of the people involved occasionally suffer slight alterations.

The common source is Ibn al-Qāḍī. His version of the events is as follows.[45]

'Abd al-Ḥaqq is a sultan without power, in the hands of the Waṭṭāsid viziers. He realizes that they run the country and that he is a virtual prisoner in their hands. The third vizier, Yaḥyā ibn Yaḥyā, makes all sorts of innovations in the army and the state. He dismisses the *qāḍī* of Fās, Sīdī Muḥammad 'Īsā ibn 'Allāl al-Maṣmūdī, and appoints Ya'qūb al-Tasūlī. This is a very unpopular measure since al-Maṣmūdī was reputed for his justice and piety. The sultan then sees that the vizier intends to seize power for himself, so he plots against him and has all the Banū Waṭṭās family slaughtered except for two of its members. One of these, Muḥammad al-Shaykh, becomes master of Aṣīla.

After this coup, 'Abd al-Ḥaqq, now the total master, does not know whom to appoint as the next vizier. Knowing that the people and part of the aristocracy reproach him for the killing of the Waṭṭāsids and support Muḥammad al-Shaykh, he decides to punish them by appointing a Jew over them.

Two Jews, Hārūn and Shawīl, rule with absolute and independent power, tyrannically oppressing the people of Fās, including the *shurafā'* and the *'ulamā'*.

He (Hārūn or 'Abd al-Ḥaqq) appoints as magistrate (*ḥākim*) a man called

[40] Lévi-Provençal, *Historiens des Chorfa*, 100 ff.

[41] cf. ed. Allouche, Rabāṭ, 1936.

[42] In his subsequent book *Jadwā al-iqtibās* (Fās, 1303/1891), a dictionary of worthy persons of Fās, Ibn al-Qāḍī does not add anything new to the *Durra* concerning the revolution but includes biographical notes (see below) on the people involved. Finally, in his historical *urjūza* entitled *Durrat al-sulūk* (Rabat, MS 372) he dedicates four verses to the short reign of the *mizwar al-shurafā'* Muḥammad ibn 'Imrān (869–76/1465–71).

[43] Corcos, ' Les juifs du Maroc et leurs Mellahs ', p. xxiv.

[44] 'Abd al-Salām al-Qādirī lived from 1058/1648 to 1110/1698. Cf. Lévi-Provençal, op. cit., 276.

[45] *Durra*, II, 391 ff.; *Jadwā*, 474.

al-Ḥusayn.[46] The *Durra* does not say if this Ḥusayn is also a Jew, but later it seems to consider him so.

On one occasion, this Ḥusayn is collecting the taxes, trying to extract money from a *sharīfa*. She resists and invokes the Prophet. Ḥusayn becomes so furious that he strikes her.

The news spreads among the people, who come to the *khaṭīb* of the Qarawiyyīn, 'Abd al-'Azīz ibn Mūsā al-Waryāghilī, well known for his speeches against the Jews.

Al-Waryāghilī incites the people to rise against the Jews and the sultan and to pay homage to the *mizwar al-shurafā'* Muḥammad ibn 'Alī ibn 'Imrān al-Jūṭī, called al-Ḥafīd.

The people rebel. The *sharīf* and the *qalqaliyyīn* (agitators, rebels), go to the Mellāḥ where they kill the Jews and take their property. They also plunder the palace.

Meanwhile, the sultan and Hārūn are away from Fās on an expedition. When the news of the rebellion reaches 'Abd al-Ḥaqq, he hurries back to Fās. However, he is worried because he sees the loyalty and morale of his army dwindling. Troop after troop abandons him at every stage on his way back, so that he is convinced that he is lost.

Near Fās he consults his vizier Hārūn and is advised to go to the loyal town of Meknes and follow events from there. However, a member of the family kills Hārūn on the spot, saying that he will not continue to take orders from Jews.

The guards then take 'Abd al-Ḥaqq as prisoner to Fās. The *sharīf* and the people come out towards him and, taking away his royal insignia, put him on a donkey, lead him into the city, and eventually execute him on 27 Ramaḍān 869/23 May 1465.

'Abd al-Salām al-Qādirī's account is very brief: [47]

In 869 the people of Fās (both the *'āmma* and the *khāṣṣa*) rose against their sultan in a movement organized by al-Waryāghilī, because 'Abd al-Ḥaqq had appointed a Jew as *wālī*.

Al-Waryāghilī made the people swear loyalty to the *mizwar al-shurafā'* Muḥammad ibn 'Imrān who stayed in power until 875 when Yūsuf ibn Manṣūr ibn Zayyān al-Waṭṭāsī entered Fās, and dismissed and exiled him to Tunis with his family. There they remained until the Sa'ādīs came to power.

Al-Qādirī quotes al-Wansharīshī (without specifying which work) for this particular episode.

Muḥammad al-Qādirī in his *Nashr al-mathānī* [48] summarizes, as he himself says, his grandfather's and Ibn al-Qāḍī's version without variation and without adding anything new.

In the nineteenth century, Aḥmad ibn Khālid al-Nāṣirī (d. 1315/1897) combines in his *Kitāb al-istiqṣā'*, a general history of Morocco (finished in 1298/1881), the above versions into a long account, the last in this series. His story is important not only because it brings together the previous ones with a different tone, but also because it is the one taken up by modern European authors.[49]

[46] The ed. of Allouche says *lḥsīn* but, as will be seen from later texts, this is obviously an error of reading or of copying.

[47] *Al-Durr al-sanī*, Fās, 1309/1891, 23–4. Cf. G. Salmon, ' Les Chorfa idrisides de Fès d'après Ibn aṭ-Ṭayyib al-Qâdiry ', *Archives Marocaines*, I, 3, 1904, 439.

[48] Fās, 1310/1892–3, 124 ff. Tr. A. Graulle, *Archives Marocaines*, XXI, 1913, 270–1.

[49] Mainly Cour, op. cit., and Terrasse, op. cit.

His main source is again Ibn al-Qāḍī, whose version he follows step by step. He never mentions him, but reproduces several paragraphs verbatim as well as some of the *Nashr al-mathānī*.

He quotes, under the name of *Manwīl* the *Historia de Marruecos* of a contemporary Spanish author, Manuel Castellanos [50] for the events previous to the rebellion and incorporates also information not to be found in the authors mentioned so far.

His account will not be summarized since it is very close to Ibn al-Qāḍī's; only the points at which he differs or which he adds will be noted.[51]

Al-Nāṣirī is the only Moroccan author to mention, while relating the end of 'Abd al-Ḥaqq, the contemporary fight against the Portuguese and the Spaniards. He insists also on the financial oppression suffered by the people of Fās: 'Abd al-Ḥaqq appoints Hārūn and Shawīl to the vizierate. Hārūn in his turn appoints another Jew, called Ḥusayn, as *ṣāḥib al-shurṭa*: 'Ḥusayn would spare no effort in mistreating and oppressing the people, dispossessing them of their wealth'.[52] This—the power of the Jews and the financial situation—is the main cause of the increasing discontent.

Al-Nāṣirī then inserts a very short sentence: 'in this year of 867 the Spaniards took Gibraltar . . .'. Again, just before starting the account of how the rebellion was set off by Ḥusayn striking the *sharīfa*, he devotes three lines to the statement that, shortly before, the Portuguese had conquered Tangier.

Probably misreading or misinterpreting Ibn al-Qāḍī, al-Nāṣirī says that the rebellion was headed by 'the people of the quarter of Qalqaliyyīn'. This was the name of a quarter existing in Fās in al-Nāṣirī's time. Le Tourneau [53] describes this neighbourhood as being in the south-western part of Fās al-Bālī, by the river. It was one of the poorest and most ill-famed quarters of the town, inhabited by people of low condition, new immigrants, or marginal members of society. This description of the Qalqaliyyīn, similar to what is known of the *wakkāra* mentioned by 'Abd al-Bāsiṭ, could indicate that the misinterpretation of al-Nāṣirī was influenced by knowledge of the version of the former.

Al-Waryāghilī is, as usual, the instigator of the rebellion, but the *sharīf* is the one who goes, at the head of the rebels, to meet 'Abd al-Ḥaqq outside Fās when he comes back as a prisoner of his own troops. He takes the royal insignia from him and shows him on a donkey to the people, before taking him to the place of execution where 'Abd al-Ḥaqq is beheaded.

Essentially 'Abd al-Bāsiṭ and al-Nāṣirī—as well as Ibn al-Qāḍī, on whom the latter is based—are telling the same story in the same way.

In al-Nāṣirī, as in 'Abd al-Bāsiṭ, the awful fact of a revolution against a legal sultan practically disappears from the centre of the narrative, sandwiched between detailed accounts of the wickedness and righteous punishment of the Jews and the killing of the sultan.

What is interesting is that this narrative structure, which in 'Abd al-Bāsiṭ's version serves an apologetic purpose, loses its function in Ibn al-Qāḍī and al-Nāṣirī. These two authors do not try to leave the *sharīf* free from all blame. Destiny does not seem to play the role of an agent, while human responsibility is more apparent: there is no forcing of the *'ulamā'* to ratify the rebellion, nor does the *sharīf* show any reluctance to rebel. Indeed the role of the *sharīf* is

[50] Santiago, 1878.
[51] *Kitāb al-istiqṣā'*, 90–100. Tr. I. Hamet, *Archives Marocaines*, XXXIII, 1934, 468–76.
[52] *Kitāb al-istiqṣā'*, 98.
[53] *Fès avant le protectorat*, Casablanca, 1948, 220.

quite clear. He heads the rebels when they plunder the Mellāḥ and when they go to meet 'Abd al-Ḥaqq. His responsibility is especially evident in the death of the sultan, the account of which contrasts sharply with that of 'Abd al-Bāsiṭ. The two versions reveal two different interpretations or intentions.

'Abd al-Bāsiṭ presents the death of the sultan as a ritual killing carried out on the spur of the moment by a band of outcasts. No responsibility on the part of the *sharīf* is implied.

According to al-Nāṣirī's more plausible description, the death is a public execution carried out after the *sharīf* has shown 'Abd al-Ḥaqq, stripped of his royal insignia and seated on an unharnessed donkey, to the people of Fās.

Thus the narrative structure of 'Abd al-Bāsiṭ, which fits the purpose of his account perfectly, is employed by Ibn al-Qāḍī and al-Nāṣirī for a different purpose for which it is not at all suitable.

What seems to have happened is that, in the century of transmission from the times of the events to that of Ibn al-Qāḍī, the apologetic purpose of 'Abd al-Bāsiṭ's version disappears, allowing different details to be inserted into the framework to produce a quite different impression.

This is confirmed by the only extant version dated between 'Abd al-Bāsiṭ and Ibn al-Qāḍī, which to some extent covers the gap between both authors. Leo Africanus, in a little-known work entitled *De viris quibusdam illustribus apud Arabes* devoted to illustrious men of science, includes, oddly enough, a whole chapter about Hārūn.[54]

' De Haron, filio Senton '[55]

' Haron, filius Senton, ex nobilissimis Judaeis Civitatis Fes natus est, qui Medicus, Philosophus atque Astrologus extitit. Servitiis Regis Habdalac in juventute sua instetit. Cui Regi Consiliarius erat, qui Regnum et Regem gubernaverat: nec valebat Rex aliquid praecipere, adeoque ut dictus Haron docuerit eum interficere, dictum consiliarium. Post ejus interfectionem, dictus Haron in consiliarium assumptus est, et propter multa populo Fes gesta iratus est Rex; et dedit eis gubernatorem praedictum Judaeum; ita ut per septem annos in magistratu moratus fit. Dictus vero Rex perrexit in castra, et cum elongatus fuisset, quasi per centum miliaria, Populus Fes rebellis factus est, et omnes judaeos interfecerunt, et cum hoc pervenisset ad castra, omnes duces, et capitanei et nobiles contra Regem insurrexerunt, et praedictum Haron interfecerunt apud Regem. Et ita Rex reversus ad Fes, cum per sex miliaria civitati adesset residuum aciei aufugit, et in Fes ingressus est, et Rex propter podagram aufugere nequivit: adeoque populi Principes cum exercitu advenerunt et supra claudam mulam duxerunt; qui cum terram novam ingressus esset, jugulatus est. Hic ultimus quidem Rex de domo Banimarim fuit. Jugulatus autem dictus Rex et Haron anno octingentesimo septuagesimo secundo de Elhegira (anno Christi 1467).'

Many details to be found in Ibn al-Qāḍī and al-Nāṣirī are already here. Between 'Abd al-Bāsiṭ and Leo, Hārūn becomes an important physician, philosopher, and astrologer (instead of the small money-changer). It is he who advises 'Abd al-Ḥaqq to kill the Banū Waṭṭās.

[54] *De viris quibusdam illustribus apud Arabes, libellus Johannis Leonis, Africani* (J. A. Fabricius (ed.), *Bibliotheca Graeca*, XIII), Hamburg, 1726, 298.

[55] Senton, with Sentó or Sinton, Spanish form of Shem Tov. Usual among the Moroccan families descending from the Megorashim, Spanish Jews who emigrated to Morocco. Cf. Corcos, *Studies*, 196, no. 278; Eisenbeth, *Les juifs de l'Afrique du Nord*, 172. I. Hamet, ' Les juifs du Nord de l'Afrique (noms et surnoms) ', *Académie des Sciences Coloniales. Comptes Rendus des Séances, Communications* (Alger), x, 1928, 202.

These are all the accounts of the revolution of 1465 provided by the Moroccan tradition.

Within this tradition, however, we can also include some biographical information in which the incidents are mentioned. The biographies—to be found in the books of *manāqib* already quoted and elsewhere—of the people involved in the revolution supply further details about it, mainly concerning their different attitudes. These biographies throw further light on the problem of who was involved and how.

We have already seen how the role of al-Waryāghilī in connexion with the revolution is underlined in all the accounts of the Moroccan tradition. In the biographical notes devoted to him he is always mentioned as *huwa alladhī kāna ʿalā yadihi al-qiyām* (or *qiyām ʿāmmat Fās*) *ʿalā al-sulṭān ʿAbd al-Ḥaqq*. The biographies also mention an anecdote in connexion with Shaykh Aḥmad Zarrūq, important because it is indicative of dissidence among the notables of Fās.

In chronological order, the passages in which it is contained are as follows.

Aḥmad Bābā, *Nayl al-ibtihāj*.[56] 'The Shaykh Zarrūq says in his *Kināsha*: the *faqīh* (al-Waryāghilī), eloquent, outspoken *khaṭīb*, he was strong and solid in Allāh's religion. He threw himself into matters of moment (*yalqā nafsahu fī 'l-ʿaẓā'im*) without hesitating. . . . Some people say: he was *faqīh* and *khaṭīb* of the Qarawiyyīn, thunderbolt of the age. The rebellion against ʿAbd al-Ḥaqq al-Marīnī was at his hands.'

Ibn al-Qāḍī, *Durrat al-ḥijāl*.[57] ' ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz ibn Mūsā al-Waryāghilī, *faqīh* and *khaṭīb* in the Qarawiyyīn of Fās the protected, thunderbolt of the age, he was the one by whose hand was the rebellion against ʿAbd al-Ḥaqq. . . . Abū 'l-ʿAbbās Aḥmad Zarrūq ceased praying behind him because of this, calling ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz a *ghandūr* of the greatest boldness and saying, " I do not trust him to lead my prayer . . .".'

Muḥammad al-Qādirī, *Nashr al-mathānī*.[58] 'Shaykh Zarrūq did not pray behind the *imām* of the Qarawiyyīn, Sīdī ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz al-Waryāghilī, despite his asceticism, piety, and learning, and despite the fact that Shaykh Zarrūq's praise for him was known because of the revolt by the people of Fās against ʿAbd al-Ḥaqq al-Marīnī on account of his stated opinion (*mushāwara*) that the Jew whom ʿAbd al-Ḥaqq had placed over them should be killed. And he used to say about him: " I will not pray behind Sīdī ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz because he is *ghandūr ka 'l-mulāʿib* ".'

Al-Kittānī, *Salwā al-anfās*.[59] Follows Aḥmad Bābā in his description of al-Waryāghilī as a man who 'throws himself into matters of moment'. He quotes also Ibn al-Qāḍī's paragraph entirely and adds, obviously quoting al-Qādirī: 'The Shaykh Zarrūq did not pray behind the *imām* al-Waryāghilī, the most pious and ascetic of the men of his time, because of his counsel (*ishāra*) to the people of Fās to kill the Jew whom ʿAbd al-Ḥaqq had appointed over them after he had humiliated them. And he used to say: " I do not pray behind Sīdī ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz because he is *ghandūr ka 'l-mudāʿib* " '.

Al-Nāṣirī, *Kitāb al-istiqṣā'*.[60] Repeats, as Aḥmad Bābā (quoting Zarrūq) and al-Kittānī, the sentence about al-Waryāghilī throwing himself into matters of moment. Later [61] he adds: 'Trustworthy people report that the Shaykh Abū

[56] *Nayl al-ibtihāj*, Cairo, 1932, 182.
[57] op. cit., II, 376.
[58] op. cit., II, 56.
[59] op. cit., II, 80–1.
[60] op. cit., 99.
[61] op. cit., 100.

'l-ʿAbbās Aḥmad Zarrūq, may Allāh pity him, had ceased praying behind al-Waryāghilī because of his attitude towards the sultan ʿAbd al-Ḥaqq. He used to say: "I do not trust my prayer to a *ghandūr*, it would be spoiled". A *ghandūr*, in the language of the Maghrib, is a man full of passion and pride'.

Al-Nāṣirī's explanation is probably not correct in this instance.[62] According to Dozy, *ghandūr* is a man who (*inter alia*) pretends to be what he is not. This agrees with al-Qādirī who glosses the term *ghandūr* with *mulāʿib*. Al-Kittānī reads *mudāʿib* in the sense of 'playful'. But in view of Dozy's meaning it seems more appropriate to accept *mulāʿib*, in the sense of 'fraudulent'.[63] Zarrūq's charge against al-Waryāghilī, in other words, is that he was a rebel or, at least, that he was a hypocrite.

On the other hand, Abū 'l-ʿAbbās Aḥmad ibn Aḥmad al-Burnūsī, known as Zarrūq—born in Morocco in 846/1442 and died in Tripolitania in 899/1493—is a very well-known, respected, and sanctified personage in northern Morocco.[64]

While al-Waryāghilī was an outstanding master of the Jazūliyya, Zarrūq, who was considered to be one of the orthodox Ṣūfī masters, founded a *ṭarīqa* of his own, the Zarrūqiyya, with his own *ṭā'ifa* or group of followers.[65] His *ṭarīqa* was Qādirī, but with strong Shādhilī influences.[66]

He was a very close disciple of Muḥammad al-Qawrī. With him, Zarrūq was educated as a *faqīh* and eventually succeeded his master as *muftī* of Fās.[67]

Both as *faqīh* and as Ṣūfī master he is the author of many works,[68] among them, the *Kināsha* or *Kunnāsh fī ʿilm al-āsh*, composed *c.* 896/1490,[69] a collection of writings on different subjects quoted by Aḥmad Bābā [70] and al-Kittānī [71] and which is one of al-Nāṣirī's sources for the Marīnid period of his *Kitāb al-istiqṣā'*.[72] This *Kunnāsh* is also quoted and partly translated by Khusaim in his biography.[73] It seems that it contains, among other things, a short autobiography from which we learn the following: first of all it gives an indication that Zarrūq, being a well-known figure at Fās in his youth was involved in some sort of political activity.[74] He obviously was opposed to the revolution of 1465—but not because he favoured the sultan [75]—as the anecdote

[62] In al-Andalus, *ghandūr* is 'a young man of low social class who pretends elegance, is fond of women, lives without working, and easily takes up arms'. (This is very close also to Dozy's definition.) In Spanish, this term has given *gandul*: 'lazy, good-for-nothing'. In the fifteenth century it also meant 'rebel, mutinous' and was applied to those in revolt or war against the government: J. Corominas, *Diccionario etimológico de la lengua castellana*, Madrid, 1954.

[63] cf. Wehr, Lane.

[64] Ibn ʿAskar, *Dawḥa*, 38, tr. Graulle, *Archives Marocaines*, XIX, 1913, 89–93; Aḥmad Bābā, *Nayl*, 71; al-Kittānī, *Salwā*, III, 183; Ibn al-Qāḍī, *Jadwā*, 64. On his legends and miracles, see *Archives Berbères*, I, 1915–16, 293 ff.; T. H. Weir, *The Shaykhs of Morocco in the XVIth century*, Edinburgh, 1904, 177 ff. Especially for the biography and catalogue of his works, see A. F. Khusaim, *Zarrūq the Ṣūfī*, Tripoli, 1976.

[65] Muḥammad al-Mahdī al-Fāsī, *Tuḥfat ahl al-ṣadīqiyya bi-asānīd al-ṭā'ifa al-jazūliyya wa 'l-zarrūqiyya*. Cf. Ibn ʿAskar, op. cit., 254; Cour, *La dynastie ... des Beni Ouattas*, 65.

[66] Khusaim, op. cit., 97; Trimingham, *Sufi orders*, 87.

[67] *Akhadha bi-madīnat Fās ʿan al-imām Abī ʿAbd Allāh Muḥammad al-Qawrī*: Ibn al-Qāḍī, *Jadwā*, 64; Khusaim, op. cit., 14.

[68] Brockelmann, *GAL*, Suppl., II, 360; Khusaim, op. cit.

[69] Khusaim, op. cit., 57.

[60] Aḥmad Bābā, op. cit., 182.

[71] Al-Kittānī, op. cit., II, 80; R. Basset, 'Recherches bibliographiques sur les sources de la Salouat al-anfās', *Recueil de mémoires et de textes publié en l'honneur du XIV Congrès des Orientalistes, Alger, 1905*, 31.

[72] Lévi-Provençal, op. cit., 397.

[73] Unfortunately the reference (Khusaim, op. cit., 57) to a MS copy in the British Museum is either incomplete or inexact, and despite the help of the staff of the Oriental Department I have not been able to find any trace of the work.

[74] Khusaim, op. cit., 15.

[75] ibid., 16.

of his quarrel with al-Waryāghilī shows and as the fact that he was obliged to leave Fās in 870 seems to indicate.[76] He was not only obliged to leave Fās but also accused of taking a favourable attitude towards the Jews and even of being a Jew himself. His reputation as a supposed Jew followed him from Fās; he was so conscious of it that he records it in his *Kunnāsh*,[77] never commenting on it or revealing the real reason.

Zarrūq came back to Fās in 879–80/1474–75 and was very badly received by a section of the *fuqahā'*; in fact, ' he was confronted with a sort of social boycott ' [78] and obliged to leave definitively for Tripolitania soon afterwards.

All this—the anecdote of the confrontation between al-Waryāghilī and Zarrūq, and the extant information about the latter—reveals, in a way which is not even hinted at in the accounts of the rebellion, division and disagreement within Fās. From this point of view this information can be compared with, and considered in relation to, 'Abd al-Bāsiṭ's story of Muḥammad al-Qawrī, opposed to the rebellion and only under threat of death giving the *fatwā*. The comparison is more meaningful since Aḥmad Zarrūq was a disciple of al-Qawrī.[79]

Like the tip of an iceberg, the anecdote is indicative of a party or at least a group of *'ulamā'* opposed to the party which led the revolution.

Another resemblance between this anecdote of al-Waryāghilī and Zarrūq and the account of 'Abd al-Bāsiṭ is the possible implication of the use of the term *mushāwara* (opinion or legal consultation) by al-Qādirī, as regards the forced *fatwā*. It could imply that al-Waryāghilī himself gave the *fatwā* legalizing rebellion. On the other hand, the *ishāra* which is al-Kittānī's rendering of *mushāwara* would simply mean that he urged the killing without necessarily giving a *fatwā*, and that may be all that al-Qādirī's *mushāwara* amounts to.

I have not been able to find in the *Mi'yār* of al-Wansharīshī any information related to the revolution of 1465 [80] nor a *fatwā* of al-Qawrī, Zarrūq, or al-Waryāghilī concerning these events.

However, immediately after narrating the revolution of Fās and the execution of the sultan, al-Nāṣirī closes the chapter with the following paragraphs.[81]

' In 849 died the Shaykh Abū Muḥammad 'Abd Allāh al-'Abdūsī, *muftī* of Fās.

In 872 died the *imām* of Fās Shaykh Abū 'Abd Allāh Muḥammad ibn Qāsim al-Andalusī, known as al-Qawrī.

In 899 died . . . the Shaykh Abū 'l-'Abbās Aḥmad Burnūsī called Zarrūq.'

The first *shaykh* mentioned, al-'Abdūsī, is also a well-known figure: he was *muftī* and *khaṭīb* at the Qarawiyyīn. Al-Waryāghilī was one of his disciples and the one who succeeded him in his post.[82]

[76] Zarrūq himself gives the explanation that he divulged a secret of his Ṣūfī master al-Zaytūnī who sent him away to pray in penitence (Khusaim, op. cit., 14). Ibn 'Askar (loc. cit.) gives a more legendary explanation, also related to al-Zaytūnī.

[77] Khusaim, op. cit., 17.

[78] Khusaim, op. cit., 23.

[79] It could imply that al-Qawrī, being like Zarrūq opposed to the rebels, was used by them in their account, transmitted by 'Abd al-Bāsiṭ, as the legalizer, even forced, of the rebellion in the same way that Zarrūq was accused of being a Jew.

[80] 'Abd al-Salām al-Qādirī quotes al-Wansharīshī as his source for the events of 1465. Al-Wansharīshī is also the author of a work entitled *Wafayā* (cf. Lévi-Provençal, op. cit., 394) one of the sources of the *Nashr al-mathānī*. Al-Kittānī says that he gets part of his information on al-Waryāghilī from ' the *fahrasa* of the author of *al-Mi'yār* '.

[81] Al-Nāṣirī, op. cit., 101.

[82] *waliya al-khaṭāba ba'dahu Abū Fāris 'Abd al-'Azīz al-Waryāghilī*. Cf. Aḥmad Bābā, *Nayl*, 157; Ibn al-Qāḍī, *Jadwā*, 238.

Al-'Abdūsī, as *muftī*, is the author of numerous *fatwās* gathered by al-Wansharīshī. Some are directed against the Jews but one of them in particular is interesting considering the relationship existing between al-'Abdūsī and some of the participants in the rebellion. The *fatwā* says that if one Jew causes damage to a Muslim thus breaking the pact of the *dhimma*, the pact is not only broken for him but for all his co-religionists. Their property may then be taken and treated as booty or *fay'*.[83]

Al-'Abdūsī is also mentioned in the compilation of *manāqib* of Idrīs II written by Muḥammad ibn Ja'far al-Kittānī, entitled *al-Azhār al-'āṭira*,[84] in connexion with the discovering of the tomb of Mawlāy Idrīs in 841/1437. When the body was found, according to al-Kittānī, the *sharīf* Abū 'l-Ḥasan 'Alī ibn Muḥammad ibn 'Imrān al-Jūtī, *mizwar al-shurafā'*, the vizier Abū Zakariyyā' Yaḥyā al-Waṭṭāsī, and the *faqīh* al-'Abdūsī, went to the mosque and held council to decide about the affair. They decided to leave the remains of Idrīs in their place but to cover the tomb with a building which would differentiate it from the others.

The *sharīf* mentioned is the father of the one who was going to take power in 1465. According to *al-Azhār* the 'Imrāniyyīn had held for half a century the post of *mizwar al-shurafā'* of Fās, to which was now added the administration of the mausoleum of Idrīs.

From this we can infer the existence of a *sharīfī* party to which both al-'Abdūsī and his disciple al-Waryāghilī were very close, and a group or party of opponents, represented by al-Qawrī and Aḥmad Zarrūq.

What place did the Waṭṭāsids take in relation to these parties ? Despite their previous closeness to the *shurafā'* there is little evidence of the role they were playing in Fās at the time. There are, however, certain indications.

First, 'Abd al-Ḥaqq is said to have appointed a Jew as a punishment for the people of Fās for supporting the Waṭṭāsids in exile.

Second, the Waṭṭāsids immediately attempt to return, the moment they know that the *sharīf* has taken power.[85]

Third, another anecdote is to be found in the account of Ibn al-Qāḍī and al-Nāṣirī which becomes relevant in the light of the *manāqib* biographies: the last Waṭṭāsid vizier dismissed the *qāḍī* of Fās and put another man in his place. Al-Nāṣirī even hints that this was the last straw which made 'Abd al-Ḥaqq decide to get rid of the Banū Waṭṭās, because he saw that they were plotting to take power.

The *qāḍī* dismissed was Sīdī Abū 'Abd Allāh Muḥammad 'Īsā ibn 'Allāl al-Maṣmūdī. He was *shaykh al-jamā'a*, *faqīh*, and *qāḍī* in Fās, famous for his knowledge, justice, and piety; he was also *imām* and *khaṭīb* in the Qarawiyyīn (a post which indeed seems to play a very important political role). He was professor and predecessor of Muḥammad al-Qawrī.[86]

This is further evidence of a line joining the Waṭṭāsids, the *shurafā'*,

[83] Aḥmad ibn Yaḥyā al-Wansharīshī, *al-Mi'yār al-mu'rib*, Fās, 1314–15/1896–7, II, 202–3.

[84] Al-Kittānī, *al-Azhār al-'āṭira*, Fās, 1314/1896, tr. Salmon, 'Le culte de Muley Idrîs et la Mosquée des Chorfa à Fès', *Archives Marocaines*, III, 3, 1905, 413–29.

[85] 'The crowd returned to Fās and paid homage to the *sayyid sharīf* Muḥammad ibn 'Imrān as their lawful ruler, thanked him by the *bay'a*, and made him king. When this became known to the Bānū Waṭṭās they wanted to return to Fās and enter the city, but the people of Fās prevented them from doing so. The *sharif* wished to remain king and he convened members of the two factions, the royal Banū Marīn and the vizieral Banū Waṭṭās. And there was disagreement between the people of Fās and those outside the city'; cf. Hirschberg, op. cit., 398.

[86] Al-Kittānī, *Salwā*, III, 314.

al-ʿAbdūsī, and al-Waryāghilī (and so, the Jazūliyya), and of another connecting al-Maṣmūdī, Muḥammad al-Qawrī, and Aḥmad Zarrūq.[87]

Finally, another Moroccan version of the events of 1465, and especially of the causes that produced them, which does not belong to the *manāqib* tradition current in its time, is to be found in an anonymous and undated (although it probably belongs to the seventeenth century) manuscript titled *Dhikr qiṣṣat al-Muhājiriyyīn* [sic] *al-musammūm* [sic] *al-yawm bi 'l-Bildiyyīn*.[88] It is a polemical work dedicated to the history of the guilds in Fās, but in reality directed against a very important class of Muslim merchants in the *madīna*, that of the converted Jews called Muhājirīn.

The extant information about these Muhājirīn is very scarce.[89] They were Jews who lived in Fās before and during the rule of the Almohads, and had originally been forcibly converted. They were allowed to return to Judaism at the beginning of the Marīnid dynasty, but when discrimination against them started again, many were reconverted voluntarily.

The new converts were far from well received by the other sections of the population. They were big merchants in general, and both Jews and Muslims mistrusted their competition, especially the *shurafā'*, so that even today there ' remain a few slight discriminations hardly noticeable yet very real and not subject to the erosion of time '.[90]

Unlike the Spanish *conversos* the Muhājirīn seem to have been good Muslims.[91]

The *Dhikr qiṣṣa* begins by narrating the foundation of Fās by Idrīs II. It describes the history and composition of the different guilds, the measures that Idrīs II took in relation to them, and the state of affairs which endured until the reign of Abū Yūsuf Yaʿqūb the Marīnid. According to the *Dhikr qiṣṣa*[92] many Jews were converted to Islam in the time of this ruler.[93] Those who had

[87] The sources quoted by each author in the Moroccan tradition are as follows.
Aḥmad Bābā: Aḥmad Zarrūq.
Ibn al-Qāḍī: Aḥmad Zarrūq and Aḥmad Bābā.
ʿAbd al-Salām al-Qādirī: al-Wansharīshī.
Muḥammad al-Qādirī: al-Wansharīshī (*Wafayā*), Aḥmad Bābā, Ibn al-Qāḍī, ʿAbd al-Salām al-Qādirī.
Al-Nāṣirī: Aḥmad Zarrūq and/or Aḥmad Bābā, Muḥammad al-Qādirī, al-Wansharīshī (*al-Miʿyār*), Ibn al-Qāḍī, M. Castellanos.
Al-Kittānī: al-Wansharīshī (*al-Miʿyār*), Aḥmad Zarrūq, Aḥmad Bābā, Ibn al-Qāḍī, Muḥammad al-Qādirī.

[88] Rabāṭ, Collection K.270.

[89] Muhājir is the surname given to islamized Jews up to the seventeenth century. Jews emigrating from Spain (there were never Jews of Spanish origin among them) called them *tornados* or *tornadizos*, a Spanish term designating those who change their faith. The word was later corrupted into *toornadis*: ' (In Fās) the families of apostate Jews are exceedingly numerous and are called *toornadis*. Not having at any time married with the Moors they still preserve their ancient characteristics and are known almost at sight to be the progeny of those who formerly embraced the Mahometan religion. . . . The Moors hold them not in the least respect and the Jews still less, had they power freely to make their aversion known ' (L. de Chenier, *The present state of the empire of Morocco*, reprint of 1788 ed., I, 156). The members of this minority were latterly called Bildiyyīn, a term still used today (R. Le Tourneau, *Fès avant le protectorat*, 205, 491).

[90] Le Tourneau, op. cit., 491. He confirms Chenier's saying (see above) that they only married, and marry, between themselves. Contrary to Chen' Corcos (' The Jews of Morocco under the Marinids ', *JQR*, LV, 1, 1964, 64) affirms that ' usually converts to Islam always maintained excellent relations with their former co-religionists '.

[91] Information about the Muhājirīn is to be found mainly Corcos, *JQR*, LV, 1, 1964, 57–65, briefly in Le Tourneau, op. cit., and in L. Massignon, ' Enquête sur les corporations musulmanes d'artisans et de commerçants au Maroc ', *Revue du Monde Musulman*, LVIII, 1924, 151–2.

[92] *Dhikr*, 467–71.

[93] In 674/1276 there was an important massacre of Jews in Fās that Abū Yūsuf himself stopped. Cf. *al-Dhakhīra al-saniyya*, ed. M. Ben Cheneb, Alger, 1921, 186; Corcos, art. cit., 58.

refused conversion, however, mocked those who had been converted at this time, calling them Muhājirīn to show their contempt.

The Muhājirīn joined the Muslims' guilds and installed their business in the *sūqs* of the *madīna* and in the Qaysariyya. From this time on they were accused of all kinds of dishonesty, fraud, swindling, and usury. They were constantly denounced to the *qāḍīs*, to the extent that the *qāḍī* of Fās had to send in his resignation because legal action (*nawāzil*) having no basis in canonical texts was taken against the new converts provoking a profusion of *fatwās* among jurists.

The complaints multiplied to the point that Abū Yūsuf had to intervene by confining the Muhājirīn to certain trades, forbidding the practice of the most lucrative or noble ones,[94] and expelling them from the Qaysariyya.[95]

By these measures, the situation remained quiet until the reign of 'Abd al-Ḥaqq. This sultan appointed a Jew called Hārūn al-Yahūdī as vizier, another, called Shamwīl or Shawīl al-Yahūdī as *ḥājib*, and a third, Ḥusayn al-Yahūdī, as *qā'id al-shurṭa*.[96]

The sultan 'Abd al-Ḥaqq decreed then that all the citizens in Fās had to pay the *kharāj*, including the *shurafā'* and other religious persons till now exempt from it.

At the same time the Muhājirīn asked Ḥusayn (' who crushed with taxes exclusively the *'ulamā'* and the *shurafā'* ')[97] for permission to re-enter the Qaysariyya. It was the time of the *'īd* and the Muhājirīn promised a *hadiyya* to be paid each year, so the sultan allowed them to do so.

Once installed in the Qaysariyya, on the following *'īd* the Muhājirīn said:[98] ' Let the other merchants in the Qaysariyya also give a yearly present to the sultan as a condition of their carrying on their trades in the Qaysariyya '. This was unprecedented.[99]

Once they had the other merchants paying the *hadiyya* with them, the Muhājirīn went to the supervisor of the *ḥabūs* (*nāẓir al-aḥbās*) and asked him to sell them the *julūs* (right to sit) of the shops, to the exclusion of anybody else.

The *nāẓir* refused, but the Muhājirīn got Ḥusayn to oblige him to do so, saying to him: ' You do not have to sell them the *aṣl*, only the *julūs*. . . . You will give the money to the sultan 'Abd al-Ḥaqq, because he is in need of it '. Ḥusayn consulted 'Abd al-Ḥaqq and he agreed, so that the Muhājirīn bought the *julūs* of all the shops in less than two months. Everybody who wanted to occupy a shop had to pay them a rent.

The Muhājirīn remained masters of the shops until the rebellion of the Muslims of Fās and the *mizwar al-shurafā'* Muḥammad al-Ḥafīd ibn 'Alī ibn 'Imrān al-Jūtī who got rid of 'Abd al-Ḥaqq al-Marīnī, killing him in Fās Jadīd. The *sharīf* expelled the Muhājirīn from the Qaysariyya and the shops in 886/1481.[100]

[94] *Dhikr*, 472.

[95] From 1438 the Qaysariyya, which was part of the sacred enclosure that surrounded Mawlāy Idrīs's sanctuary, was forbidden to non-Muslims. It was the most important place of the town for commercial matters, mainly because the *shurafā'* had their business there: Le Tourneau, *Fès avant le protectorat*, 374; *idem*, *Fes in the age of the Marinids*, 19–21.

[96] Massignon, as appendix to his article above quoted, summarizes (cf. 221–4) a MS Rabāṭ 505.I, whose title he does not mention and whose content seems to be exactly the same as the *Dhikr qiṣṣa*. For the *qā'id al-shurṭa*, Massignon reads Yahsub instead of Ḥusayn.

[97] *Dhikr*, 472.

[98] *Dhikr*, 473.

[99] The other merchants in the Qaysariyya, mainly *shurafā'*, did not have to pay any market dues or tax. Cf. Le Tourneau, *Fès avant le protectorat*, 473.

[100] *Dhikr*, 474.

None of the usual series of characters and episodes (al-Waryāghilī, the *sharīfa*, the massacres of the Jews) appears in the *Dhikr qiṣṣa*. Three Jewish officials are mentioned, as in the version of Ibn al-Qāḍī and al-Nāṣirī and, as in this version, it is the *ṣāḥib* or *qā'id al-shurṭa* Ḥusayn (who looks more like a tax-collector) who channels the furies and eventually, although not in the same way, brings the situation to a head. As in Ibn al-Qāḍī and al-Nāṣirī the financial oppression of the Muslims, and especially of the *shurafā'* and *'ulamā'*, is emphasized. But the *Dhikr* presents the events of 1465 under a very different light from that of the main tradition. Instead, the kind of information that it provides is similar to that provided by the biographies of the *manāqib* works in the sense that both, basically, point to conflicts between different groups inside Fās.

In the case of the *Dhikr* the conflict is between the *shurafā'* and the Muhājirīn, the two bigger classes of merchants in Fās in sharp financial and economic competition with each other. The crucial issue between them is the possession of the Qaysariyya. This in its turn places the sultan and the Jews in a new light. It is their intervention, motivated by the sultan's obvious need of money, which creates the dispute and brings the situation to a head.

The measures that the sultan and his collaborators undertake to ease his financial situation are particularly painful to the *shurafā'* who are losing their privileges, while they seem to benefit their rivals.

What seems anomalous is the fact that the Jewish officials are so favourable to the Muhājirīn. But there is no indication that they were themselves *muhājirs*. In fact neither this story nor the other casts much doubt on their Jewishness. Probably if the Muhājirīn obtained favours it was because they were prepared to pay for them.

III. *Jewish sources*

No reference to the rebellion of 1465 and the massacre of the Jews in Fās can be found in any contemporary Jewish source.[101] In fact, no information about it appears until the nineteenth century: the Jewish chronicles of Fās in that century contain a rather vague account. The *Yaḥas Fas*[102] says that in 5225/1465 the Jews of Fās were accused of having murdered a Muslim. The Muslims then attacked and plundered the Jewish quarter, killing as many people as they could, including women and children. Only a few families escaped: 'Rabbi Abner adds: It is to this catastrophe that the paragraph in the *Shebheṭ Yehūda* refers when it says: In the great city of Fās there was a great massacre of Jews'.[103]

There is no reference here to the Jewish vizier Hārūn, which shows that the Jewish tradition is, till now, unconnected with the story current among the Muslims. On the other hand the adduced paragraph of the *Shebheṭ Yehūda* quoted completely says: 'The Thirty-Third (Destruction). In the great city of Fās was a massacre of Jews, but as I have not found it recorded in writing, I will not describe it here. I have come across numerous extensive oral reports

[101] Nothing, either, in the compilations of *responsa* of the rabbis who emigrated to Fās in the second half of the fifteenth century: cf. Yacob Bazak, *Mishpaṭ we-halakhah. Mebaḥer teshūbot*, Tel Aviv, 1971; Simha Assaf, *Meqōrōt le-tōledōt ha-ḥinukh be-Yisrael*, Tel Aviv, 1954–7.

[102] Y. Semach, 'Une chronique juive de Fès: la "Yahas Fès" de Ribbi Abner Hassarfaty', *Hespéris*, XIX, 1934, 91–2.

[103] The same description appears in J. Toledano, *Ner ha-Ma'arab*, Jerusalem, 1911, 45. Also M. Kayserling, 'Une persécution des juives à Fez', *Revue des Études Juives*, XXXIX, 78, 1899, 315–17.

that differ from one another and are not worth noting since the story is not authenticated '.[104]

As Hirschberg says,[105] ' it must be admitted that if these doubts relate to a story of the destruction of the whole Jewish population of Fes in the days of 'Abd al-Ḥaqq, they are very justifiable, for unlike the Arabs and the late Jewish chronicles the Jews of that generation say nothing about a wholesale massacre in Fes and it is inconceivable that they should have formed a conspiracy of silence concerning such a shocking event '.

Only at the beginning of a *pinqas* of the Fās community for the years 5639–85/1879–1925 is there a note which refers to the events of 1465, including the vizier Hārūn and the episode of the lady's being beaten by a Jew. The note was copied from an original written in 5449/1689 based on an ancient source.[106] Thus, at a very late date, the Jewish tradition has incorporated the Muslim version.

IV. *The Christian sources*

Very little information referring to 'Abd al-Ḥaqq can be found in the contemporary Portuguese chronicles, and none mentions the revolution of 1465. They contain some information about Abū Sa'īd, the father of 'Abd al-Ḥaqq, and some about the Waṭṭāsid viziers,[107] the ones fighting against them in the coastal towns. The Portuguese were concerned with their conquest of the coast and matters relating to it, but they did not know much about, or were not interested in, what was happening in the court at Fās, which perhaps did not affect them.[108]

Leo Africanus in his ' Description of Africa ' is not very explicit either. He only mentions that ' Habdulac, last king of the house of Marin, was killed by the hands of Esserif, noble and powerful citizen of Fes '.[109] This is very strange since, as has been seen, Leo was acquainted with the Moroccan tradition.

He gives a more detailed description of the circumstances of Abū Sa'īd's death, attributing his murder to his indifference and irresponsibility towards the Christian conquest, mainly the fall of Ceuta. He adds that something very similar happened to his son and successor who ' was similarly killed by the people by common consent '.[110]

One of the main points of the propaganda against the Waṭṭāsid dynasty (which was ruling Fās in 1510 when Leo left Fās) was their inability to face the Christian advance. It could have influenced Leo's view of former events.

[104] ed. Wiener, 64.

[105] Hirschberg, *A history of the Jews in North Africa*, 399.

[106] ' (The king) set a Jew named Hārūn over the city as deputy. And the Jews became proud and they transgressed laws and contravened precepts and did deeds that ought not to be done, and some of them took a Gentile married woman and beat her cruelly, and she screamed and begged for mercy and they did not listen to her, and they went on beating her so that the Gentiles assembled and wreaked death and destruction upon the Jews until they had killed all the males except those who changed their religion . . .' ; Hirschberg, op. cit., 400.

[107] G. Eanes de Zurara, *Chronica do Conde Dom Pedro de Meneses*, 483–94, *Chronica de Dom Duarte de Menses*, 95–7 (J. Correa da Serra (ed.), *Collecção de livros ineditos de historia portugueza*, II, XXXV), Lisboa, 1790. This corroborates the fact of the Waṭṭāsid viziers having 'Abd al-Ḥaqq absolutely at their mercy, away from the affairs of the kingdom, not only without any personal power ' but still happy at awaking alive in the mornings '. Cf. also R. Ricard, *Études sur l'histoire des Portugais au Maroc*, 5 ff.

[108] Only a document of the following century (June 1545) mentions briefly 'Abd al-Ḥaqq's death : '. . . que bem sse sabe quantas vezes neste rreyno (Fes) despuserão rreys e ffizerão outros novos e de barro, a saber, tall que nenhuum sangue reall tynha, e isto por muy pequenas causas, que huum rrey despuserão e o matarão e ffizerão outro porque tynha dos judeus seus privados por quem hera governado ' ; Sources Inédites, Portugal, III, 426.

[109] Leo Africanus, *Historiale description de l'Afrique*, tr. J. Temporal, Lyon, 1556, 196.

[110] Leo Africanus, op. cit., 200.

However, the fact of reducing the events of 1465 to the taking of power by the *sharīf* could represent the point of view taken by the Waṭṭāsids. These, it might be supposed, would be only too anxious to condemn Muḥammad ibn 'Imrân, the man who had become their enemy, for the killing of the sultan 'Abd al-Ḥaqq. Leo's version may represent the only surviving indication of such an attitude.

However this may be, Leo's brief version is that current among Christian authors after him. As usual in these matters, Marmol's report is very similar [111] and is followed by Bernaldez [112] and Castellanos [113] who specifies that the *sharīf* treacherously murdered 'Abd al-Ḥaqq in his own palace.[114]

Conclusion

Apparently, we have abundant and diverse sources for the revolt of 1465. In fact, we are dealing on the whole with only one story, repeated through the centuries of most powerful *sharīfī* influence by the *historiens des Chorfa*. Thus, it is a *sharīfī* version, a legendary explanation of the events, with a political objective.

As the account of 'Abd al-Bāsiṭ shows, the *shurafā'*, after taking over, tried to minimize their responsibility in both the revolution and the killing of the sultan and to create an image to justify their régime. And even if through centuries of transmission the legendary elements have been eroded to a certain extent and the purpose of relieving the *sharīf* of responsibility has lost its urgency, the same story is taken up by nineteenth-century authors.

The use of a legendary version for political purposes was possible because it was built out of situations and episodes which were both plausible and familiar as accepted stereotypes to a Moroccan ' public '. Thereafter the version was appropriated by other authors, perhaps for very different purposes, and finally socialized by usage and tradition.

One of the main themes adduced as the cause of the rebellion is the existence of a powerful Jewish vizier helped by other high Jewish officials. Other Marīnid sultans had had Jewish viziers before 'Abd al-Ḥaqq,[115] and after him the Waṭṭāsids had Jews in important positions at court.

These Jewish officials—many of whom were tax-collectors—easily attracted popular anger, or were the scapegoats at moments of crisis or tension. Most of them fell into disgrace and ended murdered or executed, but generally that did not cause more—or less—concern than similar measures taken on various occasions against Muslim viziers, high officials, or even members of the royal family. Sometimes the fall of one of these Jewish officials produced a massacre of Jews (as in Granada in 458/1066),[116] but not in general, and it was never cause enough to depose, let alone execute, a sultan.

[111] L. Marmol Carvajal, *Descripción general de África*, Granada, 1573, I, 226.

[112] A. Bernaldez, *Historia de los Reyes Católicos* (Biblioteca de Autores Españoles, LXX), Madrid, 1878, 655.

[113] M. Castellanos, *Historia de Marruecos*, third ed., Tangier, 1898, 306.

[114] Later European travellers and authors still have the same account, e.g. Chenier, op. cit., II, 50.

[115] Abū Ya'qūb Yūsuf (685–706/1286–1307) had as vizier and personal adviser a member of the famous Jewish family called Waqqāsa or Roqqāsa, bankers and merchants in Fās. Abū Ya'qūb was involved in what probably was a very costly struggle against Tlemcen, and needed financial aid and advice from his Jewish collaborators (→ Corcos, *JQR*, LV, 1, 1964, 65 ff.). Another Jew was appointed minister at the court of Abū 'Inān (752–9/1352–8) → A. A. Batrān, ' A contribution to the biography of Shaikh Muḥammad ibn 'Abd al-Karīm ibn Muḥammad al-Maghīlī al-Tilimsānī ', *Journal of African History*, XIV, 3, 1973, 385).

[116] Dozy, *Histoire des musulmans d'Espagne, nouv. éd. revue et mise à jour par E. Lévi-Provençal*, Leiden, 1932, III, 70 ff.

In retrospect, the tyranny or disregard of Islam, and mainly the high position and power of these Jews is exaggerated to such an extent that it is difficult to know how many of them were actually viziers or mere court officials.

Maghribī historiography is full of stories of Jewish power (not only of Jewish viziers, but of Jewish princes and Jewish tribes)[117] to the point of producing a genre of a myth of a Jewish kingdom prevalent in the Maghrib and the Western Sudan.[118] To this genre belong the legends of the mighty Jewish viziers.

Not only would both Maghribī Muslims and Maghribī Jews eagerly accept any of these stories of Jewish power. Many of them seem to have been inspired or disseminated by Jews who, because of their abject condition, were interested in raising their social status in the eyes of themselves and of their neighbours.[119] Thus, even in the nineteenth or twentieth centuries, Jews would accept as part of their own true tradition (as we have seen in the Jewish chronicles) the story of a Jewish vizier oppressing the Muslim population of Fās and transgressing the laws in spite of its having no roots in contemporary Jewish sources.

Paradoxically, the Jews employed to glorify themselves the same stories that Muslims employed to justify measures taken against the Jews or to explain the creation of a new Muslim régime.[120]

It is very probable that ʿAbd al-Ḥaqq employed Jews in his service, especially in view of his difficult financial position. Hārūn was plausibly just a ' money-changer who dealt with the financial affairs of the viziers ' as ʿAbd al-Bāsiṭ says. Whatever the truth of the matter, however, they have been identified in the narrative of ʿAbd al-Bāsiṭ with this legendary stereotype through the episode of the *sharīfa*.

This particular episode is also the kind of anecdote which appears again and again in Moroccan sources to justify any outburst or measure against the Jews.[121]

The subsequent wholesale massacre of the Jews is no more than another literary element. Indeed there is no evidence whatsoever concerning a massacre of that size: the only source that insists that the calamity which befell the Jews resulted in their almost total annihilation not only in Fās but in neighbouring cities is ʿAbd al-Bāsiṭ whose version is the one which has the most legendary quality, although the Moroccan tradition (with the exception of the *Dhikr qiṣṣa*) continues to insist on the killing.

In fact it is not easy to admit that such an event could pass unnoticed not only in Jewish but in Christian sources and that afterwards the Jewish community of Fās could be so flourishing less than 10 years later, under the Waṭṭāsids.[122]

117 H. T. Norris, *Saharan myth and saga*, Oxford, 1972, 48 ff., 99 ff.

118 B. A. Mojuetan, ' Myth and legend as functional instruments in politics: the establishment of the ʿAlawī dynasty in Morocco ', *Journal of African History*, XVI, 1, 1975, 17–27.

119 H. Z. Hirschberg, ' The problem of the judaized Berbers ', *Journal of African History*, IV, 3, 1963, 329.

120 Mojuetan, art. cit.

121 The first example of this theme is to be found in the *Sīra* (II, 48): the Jewish tribe of the Banū Qaynuqāʿ was expelled by Muḥammad because of events whose origin was the mistreating of a Muslim woman by some members of the tribe. In Morocco, in 674/1276, the Muslims accused a Jew of improper conduct towards a Muslim woman. They killed him and began a massacre of his co-religionists that the sultan Abū Yaʿqūb himself stopped (cf. *al-Dhakhīra al-saniyya*, 186). A similar episode is mentioned as the cause for the foundation of the Mellāḥs of Marrākush and Rabāṭ (Corcos, ' Les juifs du Maroc et leur Mellah ', pp. xxi, lii).

122 To the point of becoming the subject of al-Maghīlī's persecution (see below).

There actually was an important massacre of Jews in 897/1492, and it is difficult to avoid comparing the instigator, the famous Shaykh Muḥammad al-Maghīlī, with the figure of al-Waryāghilī—so emphasized in the Moroccan tradition—and wonder if the fame and activities of the former did not reflect on the image of the latter. Even the names of both characters have a similarity.

Shaykh Muḥammad al-Maghīlī (d. 909/1503–4 or 910/1504–5) lived at the court of Sultan Muḥammad al-Shaykh ibn Abū Zakariyyā' al-Waṭṭāsī (876–906/1472–1501). Witnessing the growing authority of the Jews in the Waṭṭāsid state he became known for preaching against them and for his claim that the fact of holding high public office broke the pact of the *dhimma*. He did not, however, succeed in overcoming the opposition of the *fuqahā'*, neither would the sultan tolerate his views. Consequently he went to Touat in 882/1477–8 where he provoked the famous persecution and massacre of the Jews in 1492.

He also attempted a campaign against the Banū Waṭṭās, but was routed and had to exile himself to the Sudan.[123]

The existence of two such men as al-Waryāghilī and al-Maghīlī within 20 years of each other is very odd. Both have similar names and similar background in the Jazūliyya. Both preached against the Jews and their high position in the court and, with different fortunes, instigated a massacre of Jews and a rebellion against the reigning dynasty.[124]

Considering that 'Abd al-Bāsiṭ calls the *khaṭīb* of the Qarawiyyīn, instigator of the rebellion, Abū 'Abd Allāh Muḥammad, and that only from Ibn al-Qāḍī on (writing after al-Maghīlī) the figure of al-Waryāghilī appears, it could be suggested that al-Waryāghilī is a legendary figure built by the Moroccan authors on the account of 'Abd al-Bāsiṭ and influenced by the fame and image of al-Maghīlī. On the other hand, against this we have the anecdote of the quarrel of al-Waryāghilī with his contemporary Aḥmad Zarrūq which, if accepted as it is told, in relation to the death of 'Abd al-Ḥaqq, would make of al-Waryāghilī a historical personage and his similarity with al-Maghīlī a mere coincidence emphasized perhaps by the fame achieved by the second. Unfortunately there is not enough evidence to arrive at a final conclusion.

Nevertheless, it is clear that there was a Jewish factor in the revolt, as it is very plausibly described in the *Dhikr qiṣṣa*.

The *Dhikr* shows above all how Fās was divided into rival groups, mutually jealous and hostile, eager to defame each other with false accusations.

Fās is the centre of political tension between these different parties and groups.

The tension is motivated, in the first place, by the conflict between the sultan and the Waṭṭāsids, who are attempting to take power. They support and strengthen the *shurafā'* in order to further their aims.

The killing of the Waṭṭāsids alienates from the sultan the supporters of the vizieral dynasty whose remaining members master a good portion of northern Morocco and continue, probably, to plot in Fās.

[123] Ibn 'Askar, *Dawḥat al-nāshir*, tr. Graulle, 224 ff.; Aḥmad Bābā, *Nayl*, 330 ff.; M. A. Cherbonneau, *Essai sur la littérature arabe au Sudan*, Constantine, 1855, 392 ff.; Weir, *The Shaykhs of Morocco*, 6 1 Hirschberg, *JAH*, IV, 3, 1963, 325. Especially, Batrān, *JAH*, XIV, 3, 1973.

[124] 'In North Africa, where he spent most of his life, al-Maghīlī was witness to the Christian conquest along the coast of Morocco, to the loss of Andalusia to Islam and, as he himself attested, to the growing authority of the Jews within the Muslim states in Ifrīqiya and the Maghrib. This situation aroused the opposition and fanaticism of a considerable section of zealous Maghribian '*ulamā*' especially those of the Jazūliyya *ṭarīqa* who challenged and inveighed against the weak and accommodating Waṭṭāsid authorities'; Batrān, art. cit., 393.

The *shurafā'* and religious classes are in turn divided. There is dissidence and difference of political aims. Obviously the Waṭṭāsids are participating in these rivalries, since they support the *shurafā'*. The dismissal of the *qāḍī* al-Maṣmūdī is one of the main grudges against them.

There are also rivalries between the members of the Jazūliyya brotherhood and the unaffiliated *'ulamā'*. This powerful brotherhood had against it a party of *'ulamā'*, among other reasons, because most of the *ḥabūs* and pious foundations had been taken from them to its profit.[125] An extreme example of the existence of this enmity is the murder of al-Jazūlī himself, poisoned in mysterious circumstances. He died some time between 868/1464 and 874/1470, according to different authors.[126] His death was attributed to the *'ulamā'* alien to the movement and even to the intervention of agents of the government in fear of his growing power,[127] because al-Jazūlī's death took place after the sultan had taken some measures against the brotherhood.[128]

It is a pity that the circumstances and date of the death of al-Jazūlī remain so obscure, because (even disregarding a possible hand of the sultan in it) the details would certainly throw further light on the political groups and enmities in Fās, the same that played the main part in the revolution of 1465. But the leading role that the powerful Jazūliyya is already playing within the struggle of the different parties for power is clear.[129]

The element which brought the situation to a head might have been the economic oppression suffered by Fās. 'Abd al-Ḥaqq needed money to fight the Portuguese and especially Muḥammad al-Shaykh on whose behalf some cities (like Tāzā) were in revolt. The state of rebellion and anarchy around Fās obliged him to rely for money exclusively upon the population of the city, for whom it probably was an enormous burden and an important cause of public discontent. The financial reform that 'Abd al-Ḥaqq (probably with the aid of Jewish court officials) attempted from 867/1462 upset the situation of the important merchant groups and roused the religious classes definitely against him.

It is plausible that the Waṭṭāsids already attempted to take power in 863/1458, but the sultan anticipated it. It is also plausible that they were participating in the rebellion of 1465, with the *shurafā'* and the Jazūliyya. But the *shurafā'* were already strong enough to keep power for themselves, if only to maintain it for some years.

Concerning the way in which 'Abd al-Ḥaqq was killed there are two contradictory versions. The one proposed by Ibn al-Qāḍī and taken up by his followers in the chain of the Moroccan tradition is more plausible. Nevertheless, a judicial execution of a sultan was highly unusual and highly irregular by normal standards. It is possible that the *shurafā'* adduced various legal arguments in justification, but none of them has survived.

By contrast, the version of 'Abd al-Bāsiṭ seems both legendary and apologetic, in keeping with the passage as a whole and in particular with the

[125] Cour, *La dynastie marocaine des Banu Ouattas*, 62.

[126] Ibn 'Askar places it in 868/1464, Aḥmad Bābā and Aḥmad Zarrūq (his contemporary) in 869/1465, Ibn al-Qāḍī in 874/1470. Cf. Ibn 'Askar, *Dawḥa*, 285.

[127] Cour, op. cit., 63.

[128] ibid.

[129] Some years later (930/1523) the sharīfian Sa'dīd dynasty came to power through reliance upon the followers of al-Jazūlī, and one of the first acts of Aḥmad al-A'raj was to have his father buried beside the tomb of al-Jazūlī. Later, in 935/1529, he had both bodies transferred to Marrākush to consecrate the new dynastic connexion with the city but also to legitimize their own sharīfian pedigree (cf. *Archives Marocaines*, XIX, 1913, 288).

earlier use of the theme of the wicked and mighty Jew. At the same time it provides a subject of almost equal interest with the theme of ritual slaughter. Because of these two themes, the version of 'Abd al-Bāsiṭ can be considered in relation with the Feast of the Ṭulabā' at Fās. About 1900 this Feast was observed and described in some detail by Europeans.[130] The Feast is associated with the sultanate and explained in connexion with the origin of the 'Alawī dynasty in the seventeenth century.[131] According to legend the 'Alawī prince was a *ṭālib* or student at Fās who freed the city from the tyranny of the wicked Jew Ibn Mash'al, a story which derives from, and contributes to, the theme of the powerful Jew and is again used (see above) to explain the creation of a new Muslim régime. The nature of the Feast is centred around the creation of a mock sultan who rules Fās for a week of carnival. This [132] is a final relic of the ancient custom of killing a substitute on behalf of the real king who himself at a still earlier stage was the one to be ritually sacrificed. The existence of this extremely ancient myth of kingship in connexion with the monarchy in Morocco makes it possible that in 'Abd al-Bāsiṭ's version of the killing of 'Abd al-Ḥaqq we have a further example of the use of the theme as a literary metaphor for the familiar purpose of explanation and justification.

[130] See mainly P. de Cenival, ' La légende du juif Ibn Mech'al et la fête du Sultan des Tolba à Fès ', *Hespéris*, v, 2, 1925, 137–218.
[131] Mojuetan, art. cit.
[132] J. G. Frazer, *The golden bough. Pt. III. The dying god*, London, 1911, 152.